

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 19, and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-27 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

### **Telephone Interview Summary:**

In a telephone interview with Applicant's undersigned attorney on April 8, 2009, the Examiner agreed that the amendments indicated above would overcome the current rejections. For completeness, remarks as discussed in the telephone interview are repeated below.

### **Section 103(a) Rejections:**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 9, 10-14, 16, 18-20, 22, 23, 25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel et al. (U.S. Patent 6,865,185) (hereinafter "Patel") in view of Ayyagari et al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0024434) (hereinafter "Ayyagari"), claims 6, 15 and 24 as being unpatentable over Patel and Ayyagari in view of Zara et al. (U.S. Patent 7,206,848) (hereinafter "Zara"), and claims 8, 17 and 26 as being unpatentable over Patel and Ayyagari in view of Vange (U.S. Publication 2002/0059170). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claim 1, the cited art fails to teach or suggest *wherein said request includes information indicating a current user role*. The Examiner has cited Ayyagari (paragraphs [0006] and [0048]) as teaching execution of a desired task in a specified time period, and a request that for a specified QoS that indicates a time constraint. However, claim 1 has been amended to no longer refer to a time constraint. Applicant notes that nothing in the cited passage, or elsewhere in Patel or Ayyagari, describes a request that is received and propagated within a server system, wherein the request includes information

indicating a current user role, and wherein a quality of service context is established based on the current user role included in the request and based on the policy data, as in Applicant's claim 1.

For at least the reasons above, the rejection of claim 1 is unsupported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 19 include limitations similar to those of claim 1, and so the arguments presented above apply similarly to these claims, as well.

Applicant also asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims for at least the reasons given above in regard to the claims from which they depend. However, since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time. Applicant reserves the right to present additional arguments.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-90800/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/

Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255  
Attorney for Applicant

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: May 11, 2009